

REMARKS

Claims 8-14 and 16 are pending and stand rejected. Claim 13 has been amended.

Claims 8, 10-11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,537,673 to Nagashima et al. (“the Nagashima reference”) in view of United States Patent No. 5,910,882 to Burrell (“the Burrell reference”). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn in view of the amendments and the following explanation.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite, in relevant parts, a car radio with “a front panel unit including a horizontally positioned holder, the front panel unit including a radio circuit for receiving a broadcast radio program.” As described in the specification, key 9 (shown in Fig. 1) “can be used to move entire front plate 1 downward in a motorized manner, revealing a bay for a magnetic tape deck and/or a CD player.” (P. 3, l. 18-20). Thus, the “front panel unit” recited in amended claim 13 is distinguished from a mere **front surface of a conventional car radio body**.

The Examiner asserts that the Nagashima reference discloses “in Fig. 1, a car radio for receiving a broadcast radio program, comprising: a front panel (10) including a horizontally positioned holder (12) and a radio circuit for receiving a broadcast radio program.” (Office Action, p. 2). Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner’s interpretation of various elements disclosed in the Nagashima reference, as applied to the limitations of claim 13, is incorrect.

According to the Nagashima reference, element (10) of Fig. 1 is a “car stereo body,” element (20) is a removable panel, and element (12) is a connector. (Nagashima, col. 3, l. 19-24). Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion in the Office Action, the Nagashima reference does not does not disclose “a front panel unit including a horizontally positioned holder, the front panel unit including a radio circuit for receiving a broadcast radio program,” as recited in amended claim 13. In particular, the embodiment of stereo body 10 shown in Fig. 1 of Nagashima doesn’t include any “front panel unit,” let alone include any “radio circuit for receiving a broadcast radio program” in the front panel. To the extent the Examiner appears to be suggesting that the stereo body 10 meets the claimed limitations of claim 13 because the body 10 has a front face and includes a radio circuit contained somewhere inside the body 10, this interpretation is clearly incorrect, particularly in view of the amended language of claim 13 that recites a “front panel unit including a radio circuit for receiving a broadcast radio program.”

The Burrell reference merely discloses a unitary GPS receiver and does not overcome the deficiencies of the Nagashima reference as described above, i.e., Burrell also fails to teach or suggest a “front panel unit including a radio circuit for receiving a broadcast radio program.” Accordingly, even if one assumed for the sake of argument that some motivation existed to combine Nagashima and Burrell, the combination would fail to render obvious the subject matter of amended claim 13. Furthermore, Burrell teaches only that one may fit the GPS receiving unit into an opening in the instrument panel of a vehicle (column 6, lines 60 through 62). Applicant’s independent claim 13, on the other hand, requires that the handset be inserted into a holder mounted in a front panel unit of a car radio. Burrell simply does not teach such a mounting arrangement in a car radio unit, and there cannot be any such suggestion in Burrell, since the additional electrical connecting units in the device of Burrell are also situated in the opening of the instrument panel of the vehicle, fully behind the surface-mounted handset. Therefore, Burrell also teaches away from the present invention.

In addition, there would be no motivation to combine the teachings of Nagashima and Burrell, since such combination would not make sense to one skilled in the art. In connection with the embodiment shown in Figs. 1-2, Nagashima teaches operation of the detachable handset 20 by using keys 22, when the detachable handset 20 is attached to stereo body 10. If the handset 20 is detached from the stereo body 10, operating fields 52 are provided on the handset 20. Nagashima thus teaches providing multiple sets of keys for correspondingly different operation modes (and thus different physical orientations optimal for a give operation mode) of the detachable handset 20. Consequently, there would be no reason for one skilled in the art to incorporate the angled orientation of the keys taught by Burrell into the detachable handset 20 of Nagashima, since the different sets of keys in Nagashima already have correspondingly different physical orientations optimal for a given operation mode.

Since the combination of Burrell and Nagashima fails to disclose each and every feature of Claim 13, and since there is no motivation to combine the teachings of the two references in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the combination of Burrell and Nagashima does not render obvious amended independent claim 13 or its dependent claims 8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the Nagashima and Burrell references in view of United States Patent No. 5,926,119 to Lindeman et al. (“the Lindeman reference”). Claim 9 depends from claim 13.

The Nagashima and Burrell references fail to disclose, teach or suggest each of the features of claim 13. The Lindeman reference fails to overcome this deficiency. Therefore, the Nagashima, Burrell and Lindeman references do not render claim 9 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the Nagashima and Burrell references in view of United States Patent No. 4,737,656 to Gottlieb (“the Gottlieb reference”). Claim 12 depends from claim 13. The Nagashima and Burrell references fail to disclose, teach or suggest each of the features of claim 13. The Gottlieb reference fails to overcome this deficiency. Therefore, the Nagashima, Burrell, and Gottlieb references do not render claim 12 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the Nagashima and Burrell references in view of United States Patent No. 6,160,997 to Oberlaender (“the Oberlaender reference”). Claim 14 depends from claim 13, and claim 16 depends from claim 14. The Nagashima and Burrell references fail to disclose, teach or suggest each of the features of claim 13. The Oberlaender reference fails to overcome this deficiency. Therefore, the Nagashima, Burrell and Oberlaender references do not render claims 14 and 16 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Independent of the above, Applicant notes that the features of claims 14 and 16 are not rendered obvious by Nagashima, Burrell and Oberlaender, for the following additional reasons. Regarding the Examiner’s assertion that Nagashima discloses “at least one soft key” as recited in claims 14 and 16, Applicant notes that a “soft key” is a key to which various different control meanings may be assigned. In contrast to the Examiner’s assertion, Nagashima only discloses, e.g., at column 3, lines 56-58, that the **control unit as a whole** may be used for controlling various devices, and in every mode, the keys 22 are used only for **entering the relevant numbers**, i.e., a particular key 22 is not assigned various different control meanings. Hence, the keys 22 are not “soft keys” in the sense of the present invention.

Moreover, regarding claim 16, none of the cited references disclose that the broadcast station name is presented in the display, and the Examiner concedes this fact. While the Examiner contends that the display of a broadcast station name would have been obvious, Applicant notes that the Examiner is incorrectly focusing on the display of the station name in isolation, rather than addressing the entire limitation, i.e., providing a soft key (a key

having a variable function or control meaning) next to the display, to which soft key a corresponding broadcast station name is assigned in the display. This makes it possible to establish for the user a direct assignment between the soft key and the broadcast stations selectable via the key. Neither the device described in Nagashima nor the device described in Oberlaender provides such a function. It should be emphasized that both in Nagashima and in Oberlaender, keys that are situated in proximity of the display are not soft keys; instead, these keys are fixed in function, i.e., only numbers (or station numbers) can be entered via these keys. None of Nagashima, Burrell and Oberlaender teaches referencing a particular soft key to a content of the display as a consequence of the spatial correlation between the particular soft key and display.

For the foregoing reasons, claims 14 and 16 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Nagashima, Burrell and Oberlaender. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this obviousness rejection of claims 14 and 16 withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims 8-14 and 16 are in condition for allowance. Prompt allowance of the present application is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: 7/26, 2004

By:  134
 Richard L. Mayer
 Reg. No. Reg. No. 22,490
 (212)425-7200
 CUSTOMER NO. 26646
 R. no.
 36,197)